



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/683,630	10/10/2003	Jeffery R. Parker	GLOLP0113USA	1198
23908	7590	12/13/2007	EXAMINER	
RENNER OTTO BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP			VARGOT, MATHIEU D	
1621 EUCLID AVENUE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NINETEENTH FLOOR				1791
CLEVELAND, OH 44115				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/683,630	PARKER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mathieu D. Vargot	1791

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-11 and 20-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 12-19 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/3/07.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 12, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Higuchi et al (see Figs. 3, 6 and 23-25; col. 10, lines 9-41).

Higuchi et al discloses the instant method of making a transreflector from a transparent substrate wherein a reflective coating is applied to first surface areas (step faces 12a) to reflect ambient light but not on second surface areas (step differentiating faces 12b) so that these transmit light from backlight 15. This is done by the “line of site” coating set forth in instant claim 13—see Figure 3.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 14, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higuchi et al.

Higuchi et al discloses the basic claimed method as set forth in paragraph 1 supra lacking essentially the aspects of hot stamping the reflective coating, forming deformities on the other side of the substrate and applying an antireflection coating to

the second surface areas. It is submitted that hot stamping of reflective coatings is well known and would have been an obvious feature in lieu of the line of site coating taught in the applied reference dependent on ease of stamping vis-à-vis ease of deposition coating. It is within the skill level of the art to employ alternate, known methods to coat or selectively coat a substrate. Further, the latter two aspects would have been obvious features in the process of Higuchi et al to facilitate the distribution of light from the backlight out through the second surface areas.

3. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higuchi et al in view of Wu (see abstract; 4e and 4f in Figs. 3 and 5). Higuchi et al discloses the basic claimed method of making a transreflector lacking essentially the aspect of texturing the second surfaces and forming optical shapes thereon. Wu teaches a light panel wherein surfaces corresponding to the second surfaces of Higuchi et al have depressions 4f to aid in light dispersion, the light coming from a backlight. These depressions would constitute the instant texturing and optical shapes set forth in claims 16 and 17. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the transreflector making method of the primary reference as taught by Wu to facilitate in light dispersion from the backlight.

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In view of the new grounds of rejection, applicant's comments directed to previously applied PCT –009 and Akins et al are now not in point. Needless to say, currently applied Higuchi et al unambiguously teaches the instant invention as set forth in claims

12, 13 and 15 and hence constitutes a better reference than either of the references previously applied.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mathieu D. Vargot whose telephone number is 571 272-1211. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson, can be reached on 571 272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Vargot
December 10, 2007

M. Vargot
Mathieu D. Vargot
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1791

12/10/07